RRR
ROTHBARD-ROCKWELL REPORT
APRIL 1995, VOLUME VI, NUMBER 3

The Menace of Diversity

by Samuel Francis

The United States today is in the process of becoming some other thing than what we started out to be, and the signs of that process are all around us—in racially inspired attacks on "European Man" and all his works; in the imposition of multiculturalist curricula and agendas in our schools and universities; in the imposition of "diversity" brainwashing on employees in the federal bureaucracy and even in corporate bureaucracies; in mass immigration that changes our identity as a people; and in global economic and political integration under Nafta and Gatt and the United Nations that undermines our national sovereignty as well as our economic independence and our cultural integrity. This process of managed civilizational destruction is neither an inevitable result of irresistible historical forces nor merely an accident; it is a process that is certainly welcomed and in large part designed and intended by various elites that gain power from it, and therefore there exist a number of ideological formulas that are designed to rationalize or justify that process.

One constant theme of these formulas constructed to justify the erasure of traditional American civilization and its replacement by a new order is that America is a "universal" country, the "first universal nation," in Ben Wattenberg's phrase, and this theme of universalism and its political meanings have nowhere been as concisely expressed as in a column by George Will in December, 1991 on Pat Buchanan's forthcoming presidential campaign in 1992. Mr. Will quoted from a column or speech of Mr. Buchanan's to the effect that "No one questions the right of the Arabs to have an Arab nation, of China to be a Chinese nation.... Must we ab-

continued on page 9

THE EAR

by Sarah Barton

Which top female official in the Clinton Administration not only likes other women," asks the *New York Post*, "she also likes whips and chains?"

✦

Which one doesn't?

✦

Which Republican presidential candidate dropped out not because he hates fundraising, but because of what *The Spectator* says are "horrifying skeletons in his closet"?

✦

Carlos Salinas de Gotari, ex-*Presidente* of Mexico, will become a senior fellow of a Beltway pro-Nafta thinktank that was in the pay of his government during the Nafta fight. Salinas, who may

continued on next page

Understanding the Split on the Right

by Llewellyn H. Rockwell, Jr.

The split between the pragmatic Republican leadership and the new backbenchers grows deeper by the day. In this Congressional session, they have battled on dozens of issues. You haven't heard much about this split because the Washington press corps is largely ignorant of libertarian-conservative philosophy.

continued on next page

IN THIS ISSUE

- *NPR's "Right" to Privacy* 3
- *In Praise of Firing* 4
- *Peso Payola* 5

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Ear

continued from previous page

be the next-to-last president of a united Mexico, is already on the payroll at Dow Jones, publisher of what was for a time the *Mafia Street Journal*.

✦

Newt Gingrich's gurus, Alvin and Heidi Toffler, say we should all become "modular" people, with "modules" of personality and behavior to be used, discarded, replaced, and combined as circumstances of the wonderful future dictate. As the *New York Review of Books* points out, they see Christianity and the nuclear family as "second-wave" (i.e., outmoded) institutions.

The Tofflers, who agree with Hillary that children should be able to sue their parents for "malparenting," think that in the "third-wave"—which the Gingrichs foresee so fervently—we should reject "pronatalism" (the idea that having children is a good thing) and "demodernize" the family, experimenting with homosexuality, "serial monogamy," and "aggregate families," which should join the various children and wives and husbands of serial monogamy into one big, happy commune.

✦

What Republican Congressional leader is reputed to have mastodon-size skeletons in his closet, and therefore will do nothing to threaten the establishment? Only thing we can say for sure: they don't involve whips and chains.

✦

George Will's wife, Mari Maseng, was a highly-paid fundraiser for the Dole campaign in 88, and she will work for him this time, too. ■

Split on the Right

continued from previous page

Even before the session opened, Newt Gingrich and Bob Dole knew the 73 new Republicans would stand to their ideological Right. That's why they worked to pass the immensely unpopular Gatt treaty in a lame-duck Congress. They knew that if they waited until the new session, Gatt would die at the hands of the "isolationist" wing of the party.

What does it mean to stand "to the Right" of the leadership? This is where the media falter. They do not understand the essential divide between the two kinds of conservatism: paleo- and neo-. These are the most useful categories for understanding why Gingrich (neoconservative) would push Gatt and the peso bailout, while stopping any discussion of deep tax or spending cuts. The new members (paleoconservatives) want to destroy the central state as we know it.

The neocon voice may be tiny in the electorate at large, but it is loud within the conservative establishment. This voice is most purely embodied in the editorial page of the *Wall Street Journal*, but it also defines the views of most conservative foundations, columnists, and publications, including the *American Spectator*, *National Review*, and the *Public Interest*.

Neocons and Humphrey Democrats are surprisingly similar. On international economics, the neocons favor using state power to expand exports, control the economies of other countries, and promote democracy and development. They proudly call themselves internationalists, supporting foreign aid for "emerging markets" like Russia, Mexico, and Israel. They pushed for bombing Bosnian Serbs, even for sending ground troops. They cheered the Gulf War, enjoyed the invasion of Panama, celebrated the installation of Aristide in Haiti, and warned us about tiny, poor North Korea.

Gingrich's post-election speeches sum up the neocon view on domestic policy. He rarely misses a chance to praise Lincoln and FDR, icons of centralized power. He thinks the New Deal was great and that the Great Society had its moments.

His views are representative of neocons, who think that liberalism was fine until the presidential campaign of George McGovern. They favor gun control, Social Security, all of the New Deal, most of the Great Society, central banking and

Neocons and Humphrey Democrats are surprisingly similar.

the income tax, and do not question the legitimacy of most of Washington's regulatory apparatus. They are not keen on net budget cuts, but instead favor shifting money around from the feds to the states, from direct payment to vouchers, from the welfare state to the warfare state, while not actually lowering the level of spending.

The neocons opposed California's Proposition 187, which forbade illegal immigrants from getting tax-funded schooling, housing, medical care, food, and welfare checks. It was common sense defined, but every important neocon (Bill Kristol, Bill Bennett, Jack Kemp, Newt Gingrich) opposed it.

The paleos, in contrast, are part of a long tradition opposed to centralized power. Because the paleos are principled and not pragmatic, it is easy to sum up their views in a phrase: opposition to all

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

forms of social engineering, foreign and domestic. The paleos have fewer outlets for writing (though *Chronicles*, the *Freeman*, and the *Free Market* are solidly paleo, not to speak of the *RRR*), and they have far less money, but they are also more representative of grass-roots opinion.

The paleo position on foreign economic dealings begins with opposition to all trade treaties. The media interpret this as a protectionist position, but true free trade does not need government negotiations, subsidies, or sanctions.

Paleos oppose all types of foreign aid, whether to allies or enemies, emerging or submerging markets, socialists or capitalists. American tax dollars, they believe, should stay in America. (For this, the neos call the paleos mean-spirited nativists.) Paleos also opposed the Gulf War and intervention in Bosnia, Somalia, Haiti, Panama, and Rwanda.

With the end of the Cold War, the paleos have formed the intellectual bulwark against American intervention in any war, anywhere in the world. Because they favor withdrawing from NATO and the UN, the paleos are even more "pro-peace" than the left, with its own vision of a coercive global community.

The paleos were the key influence behind Prop. 187, but that's only the beginning. They also oppose all welfare, even for the middle class in the form of pyramid schemes like Social Security. And they support the rights of states, not by giving them controlled "block grants" as Gingrich suggests, but by abolishing D.C.'s ability to interfere with the self-government guaranteed in the Constitution.

Paleos favor sound money and oppose the Federal Reserve's ability to inflate away the dollar's value. They would get rid of the income tax and anti-discrimination law as egregious invasions of free enterprise. And they would dismantle the entire New Deal/Great Society structure of intervention.

With the end of the Cold War, the paleos have formed the intellectual bulwark against American intervention in any war, anywhere in the world.

Paleos champion the culture of the heartland, rural communities, and the South, and have no illusions about the decay of urban life and its causes. Most of all, they have a deep and abiding hatred of everything that has to do with Washington, D.C.

The newly elected Republicans in Congress identify with the paleocon view. This had led to clashes with the neocon leadership on issues from the Mexican bailout to the Brady Bill, from the Americans With Disabilities Act to social welfare agencies like HUD and HHS, not to speak of cutting taxes drastically and immediately. But they have been blocked and denounced by the leadership at every turn, in the name of its beloved Contract With America, a neocon document in all essentials.

Here's the neocon/paleocon split in action. Newt Gingrich rammed a $3.2 billion military spending bill through, but Wisconsin's Mark W. Neumann refused to go along. So Gingrich threatened to take away his seat on the Appropriations Committee.

"This is the beginning of a revolutionary momentum," said Gingrich, "you have to be willing to be part of the team." Of increased spending, apparently. But in a rebuttal based on paleo principle, Neumann called his opposition "an act of conscience."

This is only the beginning, for the paleo/neo divide means the pressure on the freshmen to sell out doesn't come from the White House, but from the Republican elite. ■

NPR and Privacy

by L.H.R., Jr.

Who has the right to privacy? The managers of National Public Radio say the national public shouldn't know about their hiring policies. They say their privacy rights should not be restricted just because they have access to $285 million a year from the taxpayers.

Meanwhile, their "news" and commentary suggest the private sector should stand naked before the state. Bureaucrats should be able to snoop without end, for example, into the employment policies of businesses and the lending policies of banks.

Thanks in part to NPR agitprop, the central government operates a virtual inquisition to ferret out such information. Federal agencies employ undercover agents to trick people into "discriminating" against a victim group. Then the bad guys are turned over to the secular arm at the EEOC. Businesses are put on the rack, and NPR celebrates. But it squeals at the prospect of NPR not being immune.

Senator Larry Pressler, the new chairman of the Commerce Committee, had the smart idea of asking NPR about its employment practices, including the ethnicity, sex, age, and salary of its workers. Mr. Pressler also wanted to know

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

how many employees had worked for the far-left Pacifica radio stations and—ingeniously—how many had worked for evangelical Christian stations.

Pandemonium! The Senator's questions "violate privacy rights," yelped PBS chairman Hank Cauthen. The head of the laughably named People for the American Way raised the specter of a "witch hunt." "It's frightening," he said. Don't you get goose bumps?

What's next? Will every business in the country be forced to turn its personnel records over to a bureaucrat on a moment's notice? Will banks be forced to reveal their customers' most intimate financial secrets to the tax police? Will loans have to be allocated by race just because powerful interest groups demand it, and carloads of data gathered and sent to the feds so they can prosecute the heretics?

All that is already the case, and it's making the "free" part of enterprise a sick joke. What Mr. Pressler asked of NPR is nothing like what businessmen—including landlords, lenders, retailers, and restaurateurs—have to put up with every day.

I'm a glutton for punishment, so I listen to NPR's absurdly biased programming most mornings. I've never once heard the businessmen's side of the discrimination racket. You wouldn't know there was one.

Thanks to the Americans With Disabilities Act, for example, an owner can't fire an employee who cusses customers or daily threatens suicide. These are protected mental disabilities, and national victimological radio heartily approves.

To the cheers of NPR, the hiring process now requires amazing agility. The interview itself is fraught with legal land mines. Ask a prospective truck driver if he's ever been a doper or a drunk, and the EEOC will require your firstborn son.

Businesses get hate mail from the government claiming they don't have enough minority this or that. The bureaucrats demand pay schedules, records, sworn testimony, and even family histories. They impose hiring quotas at every level of nearly every business in the country, and require encyclopedias of data for enforcement purposes. There is no right to refuse.

Meanwhile, virtually every means of determining basic competency has been outlawed. Forget intelligence tests. You can't even ask if the person can read. That might be discrimination against the dyslexic. And any practice, such as a written exam, that negatively affects a minority group is deemed unfair, illegal, and downright immoral.

Business could once hire, fire, and pay as its owners saw fit. That's the free market. Despite the sophistry of Washington thinktankers, there is no such thing as "commercial" as versus "private" property. Property is either owned and controlled by individuals, or it is not. And only owners know what array of workers they need to get the job done. Whom they hire is nobody else's business, certainly not the equality inquisitors'.

The federal government, and the enterprises it sponsors, are another story. When the taxpayers foot the bill, they have a right to every shred of information about how their dough is spent. If a U.S. Senator, elected by the people and responsible to them, wants to know about NPR's hiring patterns, I say great.

Does NPR discriminate on grounds of religion? Who can doubt it? And if Mr. Pressler wants to know the number of hairs on Nina Totenberg's head, fine. If she doesn't like it, she can push herself away from the public trough. The same goes for NPR. ■

Business could once hire, fire, and pay as its owners saw fit. That's the free market.

In Praise of Firing

by L.H.R., Jr.

Young workers, fresh out of school, tend to be uneducated, untalented bums who drain the profits out of any business unlucky enough to hire them. That's what the employers I know think, and now we have empirical evidence that this view is widespread.

In a study at the University of Pennsylvania, managers of 3,000 firms nationwide were interviewed about their hiring and promotion practices. Overall, they called 20% of their workers lousy. One third of bosses said an amazing 25% of their employees were incompetent.

Liberals will say this is because schools are underfunded. I've got a better explanation. Businesses are no longer allowed to drop people from the payroll as they see fit. To remedy the problem, the glorious words "You're Fired!" need to ring again in the halls of commerce.

The labor market is supposed to be fluid, with young workers gaining experience in a variety of jobs at low wages. They used to be hired and fired, hired and fired, until they became truly valuable to society. If they learned, their wages rose to reflect a growing contribution to the firms that employed them.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

But few young people today know anything about this process. For decades, the culture has lied to them about their prospects. Stay in school, said the public service announcements, and you'll be fixed for life. So they stayed, got a degree, and expected the fast-track to executive life. What they failed to learn was discipline, character, manners, and skills employers can use. Naturally, they blame this on the boss, and do even less work, of lower quality.

Employers can compensate for this only by paying low wages and reserving the right to fire—at any time and for any reason. But the minimum wage and union rules conspire to prevent low-wage employment.

And civil rights mania has effectively taken away the ability of business to fire. The EEOC, and the legions of lawyers that live off anti-discrimination suits, have given excuse-making employees legal permission to goldbrick. And today, litigious employees stay on the payroll until their net cost to the business exceeds the average cost of defending a discrimination lawsuit ($60,000). But even this defensive maneuver doesn't always work. Class-action suits can cause bankruptcy.

Practically anybody can file a suit charging "discrimination." If you're female, black, gay, disabled, or whatever, it's as easy as screaming "I'm a victim!"

Is it inhumane to fire someone? No, it's simply a signal to shape up or find someone who values you more. Nor is it cruel to want resources to be used profitably. No business should keep unwanted employees on the payroll. It is the businessman's public duty to kick out the undesirables, so talents can be sorted out and jobs passed on to those who want them and can make use of them.

The right to fire is also the employer's guarantee that he won't have to suffer incompetency and resulting losses in perpetuity. And it works both ways. Employees can "fire" their bosses by telling them to take this job and shove it.

Yes, being fired is humbling. But it's also a chance to learn. People discover how to improve their work, the kinds of employers they don't want in the future, the types of work they are good at, and jobs they should stay away from. Taken in the proper spirit, they also learn to respect the property of others, and to defer to authority.

The pervasive threat of firing also balances power within the firm by checking the tendency toward laziness. If employers have no way to fire workers, the channels of authority break down. People grow resentful of instruction. They shirk. They demand perks before they've even learned to do the job. The firm collapses into a government-like bureaucracy.

No wonder our economy is in trouble, as legal restrictions have taken away the right to fire. Practically anybody, for example, can invent a rationale for "discrimination." If you're female, black, gay, disabled, or religiously non-traditional, it's as easy as screaming "I'm a victim!" Even white males can concoct a handicap to cover gross ineptitude. All this makes entrepreneurial capitalists lay out money for services they don't want, the essence of the command economy.

The Speaker has always represented the philosophical core of his party. But Mr. Gingrich doesn't come close.

If we want to recapture American business for enterprise, and restore our prosperity, we must bring back the right to fire, and celebrate it. And we need to make sure it is exercised without restraint. Workers will learn to be more productive, managers will see their employees as assets, and instead of wasting 15 years of their life learning how to be victims, workers will prepare to do something decent for others. ■

Resign! Resign!

by L.H.R., Jr.

Republican Congressmen are going whew! over Bill Clinton's new, enlarged Mexican bailout. They won't have to vote for it and they can still get campaign contributions from the multinationals.

But thanks to a clearly unconstitutional act of executive power, the taxpayers are still on the hook through the "exchange equalization fund" and the International Monetary Fund. The total peso package will be some $60 billion now. Will Republicans also stand by as the administration converts the Swiss-based Bank for International Settlements into that ancient dream of John Maynard Keynes, a world central bank?

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

We have to count on the freshmen for principle, but they must never forget that their leadership wanted to ram the bailout through as it did Nafta and Gatt.

The peso payola is "going to happen," promised conservative futurist Newt Gingrich. "We are committed to bringing up a bipartisan agreement." These are famous words. They should also be his last as Speaker of the House.

Mr. Gingrich thought that just because the big banks, big corporations, big media, and big government backed the peso payoff, it was a sure thing. But that's the politics of yesterday. The people are overwhelmingly, passionately, and rightly opposed to any dollar pipelines to the third-world disaster called Mexico.

Paul Gigot, writing in the *Wall Street Journal*, reports that Mr. Gingrich was "the most vocal supporter of the rescue" at the January 12 "bipartisan" meeting at the White House. How is that different from Bob "the Sellout" Michel?

The Speaker has always represented the philosophical core of his party, whether Joe Cannon, Nick Longworth, Sam Rayburn, or Tip O'Neill. But Mr. Gingrich doesn't come close.

After the election, official opinion said that Mr. Gingrich was the authentic voice of the new Republican Congress. Yet he has been Mr. Clinton's ally on all important questions. From his smiling photo-ops with the President to his babbling speeches about the glories of the New Deal, he stands to the left of the party and average American voter.

As Mr. Gingrich has said, the first hundred days are the standard by which we can judge this revolution. One third of that is gone. What exactly has Mr. Gingrich accomplished? Over the objections of the freshmen, he pushed through a cheapened version of the balanced-budget amendment, leaving taxpayers vulnerable to wholesale looting by the federal judiciary.

Amidst the sellouts, the 73 Republican freshmen have coalesced into a solid voting bloc.

He gets no points for fiddling with the Congressional committee structure, or expanding the civil rights laws to the Congress. Just who is that supposed to help? As for PBS funding, it's a pittance compared to the $40 billion Mr. Gingrich wanted to place in the outstretched sombrero. And now he's even "rethinking" PBS.

Meanwhile, not one tax has been reduced. Not one program has been cut, much less eliminated. Not one regulation has been beaten back. The longer Mr. Gingrich delays the revolution, the deeper the split in the Republican coalition grows. "Hearings" don't cut it. What we need, and the voters demand, is repealing laws, smashing agencies, and firing bureaucrats.

Mr. Gingrich is not the only problem, of course. Bob Dole also attended the fateful Mexico meeting, and cheered it on. You have to wonder about a man who swears allegiance to states rights one day, and agitates for international bailouts the next.

There are other surprising casualties among the Republican leadership. Dick Armey said on national television that he wanted to trade dollars for pesos too, but on one condition. Democrats must stop criticizing Mr. Gingrich's book deal. I get it: the taxpayers were supposed to ante up so Mr. Gingrich wouldn't have to mutter "Sticks and Stones" under his breath any more.

Amidst the sellouts, the 73 Republican freshmen have coalesced into a solid voting bloc capable of resisting leadership pressure on Mexico and much else. Not even the "bipartisan" military issues unite them. The leadership promised to rebuild the old Star Wars system, as if it were 1986. Now it has had to back off.

The leadership can also forget about another $126 billion for Lockheed and the Pentagon. The mood of the country cuts against the welfare state *and* the warfare state. Americans put up with high military budgets because of the Soviets. The Soviets don't exist anymore. "I'm a hawk," says Mr. Gingrich. But what the heck is that supposed to mean? That we should bomb Guadalajara with greenbacks?

Most of the freshmen have never been in politics before, and most don't have the ambition to stay. They have nothing to gain from compromise, and nothing to lose from defying their leaders, or even forcing them out. ■

PC Watch

by L. H. R., Jr.

Jelly Rolled

The great New Orleans pianist and composer Ferdinand "JellyRoll" Morton was smeared in the Broadway show, "Jelly's Last Jam," says William H. Youngren in the *Atlantic Monthly*. The musical indicts Morton for supposedly denying "his blackness and the black roots of his music, and for refusing to acknowledge that jazz comes out of Africa." On stage, he admits his guilt, repents, and is allowed into black Heaven with Louis Armstrong, Duke Ellington, and other black jazz musicians. But Morton, as Youngren shows, was

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

what used to be called a "Creole of color," a light-skinned mulatto of mostly French descent, and he was proud of the fact. "We live in a time that is obsessed with race but that attempts to deny the very existence of class and class distinctions," says Youngren, and Morton's supposed denial of his blackness was based on class, not race.

But this outraged the producers of "Jelly's Last Jam," who even changed his magnificent music to make it sound more "black." As is, it sounded "too white."

And far from jazz being African, it clearly "inherited from European classical music not only the Western tonal system but also its characteristic modes of phrase construction, ornamentation, harmonic patterning, voice leading, and rhythmic structure (the four-beat bar and the four-bar unit)." (July 1993)

Is Your Dog a Racist?

Don't worry, says Elizabeth Marshall Thomas, author of *The Secret Life of Dogs*, if your pooch "prefers people of his owner's race." It "means only that he can see a difference between races, not that the dog or owner is a bigot." Whew!

"You do a dog no favor, however, by encouraging his racial preferences. If your dog has such prejudices, it's a good idea to accustom him to people of other races. You could enlist the help of friends of other races, who could visit with you in the dog's presence. Some attention and a few dog biscuits handed out by the friends might go a long way toward changing your dog's unprogressive attitude." (*USA Weekend*, 1/6-8/95)

Too Interactive

Thomas D. Wallace of Omaha, Nebraska, is suing Compton's Interactive Encyclopedia for $40 million because it can search its contents for the word "nigger," as it can for every other word in the English language. Wallace says he inadvertently typed the word while searching for information on the Niger River, and was given references to "Drama," "Martin Luther King, Jr.," "Black Americans or African Americans," and "English Trivia," to his great "emotional distress."

The publisher points out that the references were to Joseph Conrad's "The Nigger of the Narcissus," the title of two plays ("The Nigger" and "The Electronic Nigger"), Dick Gregory's *Up From Nigger*, an essay called "Nigger Heaven," and an incident in which King at age 11 was supposedly called a "nigger" by a white woman. (*New York Times*, 3/9/95)

Neocon Shelby Steel is for abolishing affirmative action—if discrimination is made a felony. Businessmen could then be jailed for looking cross-eyed at an applicant.

More on Denny's

Irving Louis Horowitz writes with a "strange footnote" to my defense of Denny's Restaurants, which was fined many millions of dollars for—among other crimes—making some young black customers pay in advance:

"On the evening of December 30th, after attending the wedding of a colleague's son in Manassas, Virginia, my wife and I went to a Denny's. There we found a perfectly natural and calm interaction of black and white patrons and workers. Until this was shattered by a group of black teenagers who ate their fill, got up and left without paying. The beleaguered waitress ran out into the cold night air and rightfully demanded payment. Needless to say she was mocked for doing so—and told that no one in the crowd had ordered the food, and that the person who had ordered had left early. Hence they felt no compunction to pay!

"Amidst the *Clockwork Orange* mocking and jeering of the waitress, it seemed to have been lost on all concerned that she had to make good the invoice for these 'boyz in the hood.' So in the rush to victimology of which you speak, the real victim was a working-class waitress and the real villains were the teenage toughs."

Arrest That Businessman

Shelby Steele, a neocon beloved of left-libertarians as well, has endorsed the abolition of affirmative action so long as "discrimination" is made a felony at the same time (*New York Times*, 3/1/95). Businessmen could then be jailed by the EEOC for looking cross-eyed at an applicant, rather than just impoverished, in a giant step forward for the egalitarian state.

Anti-discrimination law illegalizes motives. It is against the law to refuse to hire a black because he is a black, but not because—for example—he has a chip on his shoulder. So having the wrong motivations is now to be, Soviet-style, a criminal violation.

Is Steele's article a leading indicator? Bill Kristol and the other neocons are seemingly criticizing affirmative action because most conservatives and other Americans hate it. But the

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

neocons, as an article of faith, are opposed to shrinking the state. How to keep their leadership of the conservative movement while promoting statist goals? As usual, deceit. They pretend to be against affirmative action while supporting, and indeed wanting to worsen, the totalitarian anti-discrimination laws that have socialized our labor markets and—by abrogating the freedoms of association and contract—done so much to abolish the free in free enterprise.

Fangs a Lot

"Style is in the smile," reports the Associated Press in the *Grand Rapids Press* (1/3/95). "For the well-appointed rap fan" the "latest is worn on the teeth." They're "fangs, rap caps, or fronts. And the removable gold teeth covers—often studded with diamonds or stamped with designs—are glittering on the incisors and bicuspids of image-conscious teenagers." It's the "new style coming in," says 19-year-old Rob Hendricks, "who cracked his lips to reveal a set of the caps encasing six of his upper teeth.

'It's a thing now. They're real nice,' said Hendricks, standing in a Brooklyn mall where costume jewelry shops prominently display hundreds of the decorative dental caps."

The neocons, as an article of faith, are opposed to shrinking the state.

Another Republican Crime

As the father of an adopted child, I believe in adoption, and also believe that any legal questions surrounding it should be handled at the local level. That's the constitutional and libertarian view. But the House Republican leadership, which wants to federalize everything and halt the devolution revolution, has different views.

The Republicans' so-called welfare reform bill, which *increases* welfare spending in the name of "workfare," also makes it illegal to discriminate racially in adoptions. The leader in the effort, originated by the far-left ex-Senator Howard Metzenbaum, is Rep. Jim Bunning (R-KN).

Adoption agencies makes decisions based on race, religion, an other un-p.c. grounds. There are transracial adoptions, but they are voluntary. If the House Republicans get their way, however, white parents will be given black children, and black parents will be given white children, by edict of the central government. This is cheered on by the *Wall Street Journal*'s Albert Hunt in a series of columns, most recently 3/9/95. ■

Keep Murray Rothbard's Legacy Alive and Growing!

In a startling acknowledgement, the *Washington Post* recently admitted that the moving force behind the public's revolutionary mood in the November election was none other than our own Murray Rothbard.

Murray's last article was a fiery denunciation of the alleged leader of the Republican Revolution, Newt Gingrich. The Republican Speaker of the House began his betrayal of the American people the very day after the election, and it was Murray who was the first to point this out. Now that Murray's gone, it's up to us—you and me—to blow the whistle on this ever-accelerating sell-out.

The nonprofit sponsor of the *Rothbard-Rockwell Report*, the Center for Libertarian Studies, has been active for over two decades. Some of our work isn't flashy; we publish the scholarly *Journal of Libertarian Studies*, and support a scholarship program for promising young students. But, together with the *RRR*, this is the essence of the stuggle for liberty. This is what is behind the groundswell: a solid intellectual base. Bad ideas—redistribute the wealth, violate property rights, impose a "New World Order"— don't just come out of the sky. Hillary Clinton and Ted Kennedy get their ideas from someplace—and so do the good guys. That has been our vital role: help us to multiply it.

Please make out your check to the CLS, and send it to us at Box 4091, Burlingame CA 94011. Or phone direct to George Resch or me at 1-800-324-7257, to give via credit card.

Thank you in advance.

— Burton S. Blumert, Publisher

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Menace of Diversity

continued from page 1

sorb all the people of the world into our society and submerge our historic character as a predominantly Caucasian Western society?"

Mr. Will's response to this innocuous passage is to instruct Mr. Buchanan and us on American Nationality Properly Understood. Buchanan, he wrote, "evidently does not understand what distinguishes American nationality—and should rescue our nationalism from nativism. Ours is, as the first Republican president said, a nation dedicated to a proposition. Becoming an American is an act of political assent, not a matter of membership in any inherently privileged group, Caucasian or otherwise. The 'Euro-Americans' who founded this nation did not want anything like China or Arabia—or any European nation, for that matter."

Once we disentangle the cognitive meaning of Mr. Will's language from the snottiness that invariably embellishes his prose, it is clear that Mr. Will is here asserting a necessary premise of the political and cultural universalism by which the managed decomposition of American civilization is rationalized. America, that premise holds, is defined in terms of a proposition, and from the point of view of those who agree with this view of American identity, he is right to insinuate that Mr. Buchanan is downright un-American. If America is in fact founded on and is largely identical with a proposition, then one becomes an American simply by assenting to or agreeing with the proposition, just as one becomes a member of the Book of the Month Club by filling out the little card that in fine print details the terms of membership, and the process of assimilation as an American is no more complicated than understanding and carrying out the logical implications of the proposition or indeed of ordering your monthly installment of the immortal prose of Stephen King, Harold Robbins, and William Buckley from the Book of the Month Club.

There is no reason to learn a particular language, to adhere to particular moral and social norms that range from table manners and dress codes to the raising of children and the social uses of violence, or to conform to a set of institutions and collective habits that define American culture. Indeed, if Mr. Will were correct in his view of what constitutes American nationality, not only would Mr. Buchanan be wrong but so also would be most of the current legal requirements for naturalization, which still include learning English and displaying some grasp of the nature of American citizenship. No doubt those too will eventually be scrapped as the logical dynamic of the Lincolnian "proposition" works itself out and the distinctive and defining American civilization vanishes in the global stewpot.

Today we are quickly learning to read more carefully the fine print on the membership card of the New World Order.

The view that America is a proposition, an idea, an experiment, the product of a particular political theory or doctrine or ideology, or some other abstraction is thus an essential premise of the universalism that today serves as the principal formula of the emerging global order. There is, however, an alternative view of America that is more correct historically and more sociologically realistic. That view is that America is not a proposition or an idea but a culture, which is to say it is many ideas embodied in inherited and habitual patterns of conduct. Because those patterns of conduct or folkways are usually not the result of rational thought and argument, they cannot be adopted merely by a process of intellectual assent, and for that reason they are by their very nature not universal.

The folkways that define any society, including America, are particular and specific to it, and while aliens may eventually assimilate to the norms contained in the folkways, the process of assimilation would be arduous, painful, and unusual, and even unappealing to those outside the folkways. And, if the folkways are not universal, neither are they immortal. They are artifacts, and they are not the product of nature, and unless they are re-enforced and sustained by continuous practice, which is to say, by tradition, they will cease to exist, and with them, the political society they create and define.

In the United States, throughout its history and even today, the principal source of the folkways that define and distinguish American society and culture from those of other nations is Great Britain, and the main authority today on the British origins of American folkways is the historian David Hackett Fischer, whose book *Albion's Seed* explores in massive detail how what he distinguishes as four different ethnic and regional migrations from Britain from the 17th through the 18th centuries established the fundamental normative patterns of conduct in both public and private life in this country. I don't plan to elaborate in any detail on what Professor Fischer writes

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

about these subcultures, but I will enumerate them briefly. They include the earliest large migration from England, mainly from eastern England in the region called East Anglia, of people who were Puritan in religion and who settled in New England; those who came mainly from southern England shortly afterward and, reflecting its more highly structured society in their Royalist political sentiments and aristocratic and deferential habits of life, settled in Virginia; those, largely Quakers, from the North Midlands of England and Wales in the late 17th and early 18th centuries who settled in the Delaware Valley, including Pennsylvania; and finally those from the northern borderlands of England and Scotland who arrived in the course of the 18th century and settled the Carolinas and Appalachian regions.

"Today," writes Professor Fischer, "less than 20 percent of the American population have any British ancestors at all. But in a cultural sense most Americans are Albion's seed, no matter who their own forebears may have been. Strong echoes of four British folkways may still be heard in the major dialects of American speech, in the regional patterns of American life, in the complex dynamics of American politics, and in the continuing conflict between four different ideas of freedom in the United States,... the legacy of four British folkways in early America remains the most powerful determinant of a voluntary society in the United States today." (pp. 6-7)

Fischer's emphasis on the transplanting of these four British folkways on American soil goes far beyond the commonplace that our language and literature, our mainstream religion, and our political and legal institutions are largely British in origin, and it rather exposes George Will's "propositional" identity as the Boy Scout happy chatter that it is. Mr. Will, however, is not entirely wrong. There are indeed more abstract propositions and ideas that went to form the United States and American culture, but what he and we need to understand is that those abstractions are possible as norms only because they were inherited from the particular culture in which they developed and they acquire meaning only in the context of the historic cultural origins of the society that made use of them.

Many of the problems of public discussion that we experience today in this country come directly from the gradual loss or evanescence of the British cultural patterns that prevailed at the time of the settling and the Founding and the consequent loss of the intended and commonly understood meaning of the terms and values that the founders shared. Thus, terms like "cruel and unusual" as applied to legal punishments in the 8th Amendment to the Constitution, a phrase that derives directly from the English Bill of Rights of 1689 that was intended to ratify the Revolution of 1688, shared a common meaning in the 18th century that we have utterly lost. The concept of a "militia," mentioned in the 2nd Amendment as necessary to a "free state," is also a term and an institution of British origin that we no longer understand.

In a column in the *Orlando Sentinel-Tribune* on April 10, 1994, Sarah Brady, professional victim-crusader against guns and wife of the famous potted plant James Brady, revealed to an astonished public that "nothing could be further from the truth" that the 2nd Amendment permits private gun ownership because, among other silly reasons dreamed up by her ghostwriter, "It is now well-accepted that the 2nd Amendment guarantees the right to be armed only in connection with service in a state's militia. The preservation of a state's militia—or National Guard as it is called today—does not give private citizens the right to maintain their own personal arsenal."

There are so many fatuous errors in this brief sentence that it is hard to know where to begin to criticize it. Mrs. Brady would do much better if she just stayed home and took care of her wounded husband instead of advertising her misinformed views of both the Constitution and American history and doing all she can to take guns away from the law-abiding but nothing to restrain criminals. In the first place, the National Guard, a distinct agency of the state government in the same way that the state police are, is not at all the same thing as the militia of the 2nd Amendment, and in the second place, the whole point of the British concept of the militia, of course, is that it is composed of private citizens who own their own guns. The militia, as both Englishmen and Americans in the 18th century and for long after understood it, was not an agency of the government so much as it was a function of the society. Just as it is sometimes said that the Episcopalian Church is the Republican Party at prayer, so the militia may be thought of as the citizenry in arms, but it is the very opposite of the kind of state-maintained standing army that Mrs. Brady and other anti-gun nuts think it is.

Similarly, terms like "equality," "freedom of speech," and others had reasonably clear and agreed-upon meanings in 18th century England and America that they no longer have, so that today such words are used mainly as political weapons by which those most skilled at manipulating them can gain power instead of being used to communicate the shared values and beliefs of a culturally unified society.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Nevertheless, even though Professor Fischer asserts that the formative British folkways "remain the most powerful determinant" of American society today, that determinant is rapidly being eroded by the forces I mentioned earlier. At the time of the founding, the population of the United States was 60% English, 80% British, and 98% Protestant. As late as 1900, 60% of the population remained British, but by 1920 it composed only 41% of the population. By 1980 less than 20% reported having any British ancestors at all, and the largest ethnic stock was composed of those of German descent. This is a development that the Framers themselves feared and resisted. At the time of the American Revolution, as Dr. Wayne Lutton has shown in his monograph *The Myth of Open Borders* (Monterey, Va.: American Immigration Control Foundation, 1988), the Founding Fathers were virtually unanimous in opposing easy immigration to the new republic.

Thomas Jefferson wrote in his *Notes on the State of Virginia* that immigrants from monarchical countries should be discouraged from immigrating. "They will bring with them the principles of the governments they leave, or if able to throw them off, it will be in exchange for an unbounded licentiousness, passing, as usual, from one extreme to the other. It would be a miracle were they to stop precisely at the point of temperate liberty." Alexander Hamilton rarely agreed with Jefferson on much of anything, but he agreed with him on immigration. In a speech of 1802 he said, "The opinion expressed in *Notes on Virginia* is undoubtedly correct, that foreigners will generally be apt to bring with them attachments to the persons they have left behind; to the country of their nativity, and to its particular customs and manners.... The influx of foreigners must, therefore, tend to produce a heterogeneous compound; to change and corrupt the national spirit; to complicate and confound public opinion; to introduce foreign propensities." James Madison also remarked that "I do not wish that any man should acquire the privilege of citizenship but such as would be a real addition to the wealth or strength of the United States."—not exactly the Julian Simon view of immigration.

George Washington wrote to John Adams in 1794 that "my opinion with respect to immigration is, that except of useful mechanics and some particular description of men and professions, there is no use of encouragement," and later he wrote, "I have no intention to invite immigrants, even if there are no restrictive acts against it. I am opposed to it altogether." These sentiments were commonplace among the leaders and founders of the American Republic, and of course they were mainly thinking of European immigrants. It probably never occurred to most of them that Asians, Africans, and Latin American Indians would one day displace even the Europeans whose coming they opposed.

But, as the demographic figures I mentioned show, the advice of the Framers was not followed, with major cultural consequences as immigrants from Southern and Eastern Europe arrived in the 19th century. In *The Rise of Selfishness in America*, a little-noticed but important book published in 1991, historian James Lincoln Collier discusses the effects on the Anglo-American culture of these European immigrants. Unlike the British settlers of the previous era, he argues, the Irish, German, Jewish, and Southern and East European immigrants who came to this country in the 1800s had little attraction to the prevailing Victorian ethic that the prevalent Anglo-Saxon stock had imparted. "The immigrants, then," he writes,

> were bringing to the United States an array of habits, attitudes, and folkways that conflicted, at times dramatically, with the prevailing American patterns of thought and behavior. They were, in sum, resolutely anti-Victorian in almost every respect. They did not believe in discipline, punctuality, sobriety—the order and decency of the Victorian ethic. They wanted instead to live as expressively as they could. In what spare time they could snatch from their jobs and family obligations they wanted to drink, to dance, to gamble, to have fun. It is hardly surprising, therefore, that the people of the old stock were appalled by their behavior. It seemed to them that the newcomers were intent upon destroying the decent and orderly society that they of the old stock were trying so hard to build and maintain.

The result, in Collier's view, was that the new immigrants of the 19th century imparted to America their own cultural habits centered around "expressiveness" through their predominance in the new mass industries of popular culture—sports, movies, music, theater, journalism, mass entertainment, and the mass vices offered by organized crime under the control of new immigrant godfathers. I note this cultural transition due to European immigration not because I want to criticize the effect of European immigrants on the United States, if criticism is in

RRR - The Rothbard-Rockwell Report is published monthly by the Center for Libertarian Studies, 875 Mahler Rd., Suite 150, Burlingame, CA 94010. (800) 325-7257. Application to mail at Second-Class Postage Rates is Pending at Burlingame, CA 94010 and additional mailing offices. Postmaster: Send address changes to Rothbard- Rockwell Report, P.. Box 4091, Burlingame, CA 94011. *Editors*: Murray N. Rothbard (1926—1995) and Llewellyn H. Rockwell, Jr. *Contributing Editors*: Sarah Barton, Joe Melton, Justin Raimondo, and Joseph Sobran. *Publisher*: Burton S. Blumert. *Managing Editor*: Sybil Regan. Subscription: $49 for 12 issues. Single issue: $5. Copyright © 1995 by the Center for Libertarian Studies. All rights reserved. Unauthorized reproduction of this newsletter or its contents by xerography, facsimile, or any other means is illegal.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

order, but merely to point out that immigration from countries and cultures different from that of the receiving culture will inevitably have a profound differentiating effect on the country that receives it, and that is precisely what happened in the United States in the 19th century, just as the Framers had foreseen.

What happened in the mid to late 19th century was a combination of three forces that served to impair the unity and integrity of the Anglo-American culture that had developed in the colonial period and the first part of the 19th century. The victory of the North in the Civil War allowed an increasingly plutocratic capitalist elite to seize national power and remold the country into a shape that served the interests of the elite, and though those interests generally demanded a laissez faire economic policy and a small federal government, their interests also sometimes involved using the state in their own behalf. As Robert Higgs has written,

> Railroad promoters actively lobbied for land grants and other subsidies at every level of government. A chorus of manufacturers continually cried out for tariff protection. Big businessmen routinely resorted to the courts for assistance in their struggle against labor unions. In an age of rough-and-tumble politics and often venal politicians, the owners and managers of big businesses possessed extraordinary ability to sway the political process, and they did so with considerable success. (p. 81)

It was mainly because of the predominance of those interests that massive immigration from Europe occurred, and the conjunction of this wave of immigration, introducing into the United States cultural fragments that had little understanding of or loyalty to traditional Anglo-American folkways, combined with the unleashed acquisitive individualism of the Gilded Age to help initiate the erasure of the older folkways and the cultural and political order founded on them. In time, the new immigrants would provide the mass political base as well as the directing elite of political movements that worked against the political institutions of the Anglo-American Old Republic and its public ethic of socialized or ascetic individualism and would help form the mass society and culture of the 20th century, with their managerial elites embedded in the leviathan structures of economy, state, and culture.

The conjunction of the plutocratic elite of the late 19th century with waves of new cultural aliens served to formulate the third force that contributed to the erasure of Anglo-American culture, acquisitive individualism. For all the invocation of nationalism, the new elite formulated a new ideology that merely used national unity as a mask for individual economic aspirations and material gratification, and Lincoln's egalitarianism was a necessary premise of this ideology. Equality was justified not so much on moral or ethical grounds as on utilitarian grounds, as useful for the achievement of upward economic mobility.

The Old Republican "equality before the law" was subtly hammered into the acquisitive individualist "equality of opportunity," a formula that allows for endless intrusion and manipulation of civil society by the national state. And in the 20th century, it was the 19th century erasure of the Anglo-American culture by the forces of a triumphant plutocracy that seized national power in the Civil War, their new ideology of acquisitive individualism, and their culturally alien imported proletariat that made possible and indeed perhaps inevitable the revolutionary discarding of Old Republican political institutions and the construction of the leviathan state that we today all know and love.

George Will and his cohorts who assert an abstract, propositional, universalist American nationality are therefore wrong, though he is partially right in asserting that "the 'Euro-Americans' who founded this nation did not want anything like China or Arabia—or any European nation, for that matter." It's quite true that the Framers did not want a Chinese or an Arab or indeed a European nation, and therefore they would have opposed the mass immigration from Arab and Asian and Latin countries that we experience today; they wanted an American nation, and they explicitly understood by an American nation a continuation of Great Britain and the cultural heritage that underlies its political unity.

Today we are quickly learning to read more carefully the fine print on the membership card of the New World Order and we may recall that what Hamilton said of immigration in the first years of the 19th century remains true at the end of the 20th, that "the influx of foreigners must...tend to produce a heterogeneous compound; to change and corrupt the national spirit; to complicate and confound public opinion; to introduce foreign propensities," and that the self-governing republic the Framers created cannot endure the heterogeneous compound that the New World Order promises us. That compound will become, and is already becoming, the mass political base of the new global despotism that rises before us, and if we seriously seek to restore the Old Republic, we will first need to understand and create anew the cultural homogeneity on which it was based and without which it could not survive. ■

Dr. Francis, is a syndicated columnist for the Washington Times. *His article is based on a speech delivered at the 1994 meeting of the John Randolph Club.*

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED